

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95274
Title of the Manuscript:	PERSPECTIVES IN THE MEASUREMENT OF POVERTY IN PERU
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Manuscript could be important if reorganized properly. Being a review article, the review part is not strong enough. The information in the analysis part is totally a briefing of the relevant information that matches the subject of the study. There could be developed a very interesting argument.</p> <p>2. No, the article does not have sufficient literature from Peru. This is like comparative analysis. Suggested title is 'A review assessing the contemporary suitable methods for measuring poverty' or 'the suitability of poverty measurements in Peru: comparative analysis'</p> <p>3. Yes, need modifications according to the revisions.</p> <p>4. No, reorganization of the review part is important. The characteristics of a good review article are difficult to find out due to poor structure. No detailed introduction with suitable references.</p> <p>5. When paying attention to the methodology of the bibliography selection, there are a few points to clarify. There is no analysis part in this review paper. Just present the information. Scientifically need to improve.</p> <p>6. There are references not cited in the text. Either remove them or cite them in the text. The introduction part is missing thus use of references is not adequate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Language/grammar need to check and correct the mistakes.</p> <p>2. There are several missing punctuation marks and wrong use of punctuation marks, correct them all.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Good luck for the attempt to reveal that the poverty measurement method in Peru is not suitable compared to other countries.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>M. D. K. L. Gunathilaka</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Colombo, Sri Lanka</b>